

ATTORNEY'S DOCKET
2001P07466USPATENT APPLICATION
USSN 09/675,312REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed June 16, 2004. At the time of the Office Action, Claims 1-21 were pending. Claims 1-21 are rejected and Claim 6 is objected to. In order to advance prosecution of this Application, Applicants have amended Claims 3, 6, 10 and 15. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Specification and Claim Objections

Applicants have replaced the title and respectfully submit that the new title is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Applicants have also fixed the informality noted in Claim 6.

Section 112 Rejections

The Examiner rejects Claims 3, 10, and 15-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Applicants have amended Claims 3, 10 and 15 to address any inconsistencies in these claims and/or the claims that depend from these claims. Applicants respectfully submit that these amendments do not narrow these claims, but merely address any inconsistencies in the claims. Favorable action is requested.

Section 102(e) Rejections

The Examiner rejects Claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2002/0069272 by Kim, et al. ("Kim"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for the reasons stated below.

With respect to independent Claim 1, Applicants submit that *Kim* does not teach or suggest at least "applying a specified set of rules to produce a result set based on the service option selection and the capacity information" and "determining configuration parameters for one or more network elements based on the result set."

ATTORNEY'S DOCKET
2001P07466USPATENT APPLICATION
USSN 09/675,312

9

First, *Kim* discloses updating of servers in which "configuration parameters may be stored in a database 34 in the format of a plurality of tables. When the user modifies the desired configuration parameter . . . the server manager 32 updates one or more tables that includes this parameter. Once the one or more tables are updated in the server manager 32, the server manager 32 communicates one or more commands to one or more of the servers 22, 24, and 26 . . . [which] are configured to run a dedicated program . . . that is triggered to retrieve the modified parameter from the updated table. [T]he dacmon updates the configuration of the application program with the retrieved parameter." (see *Kim*, p.3, para. 0034) (emphasis added). Nowhere in *Kim* is taught or suggested to apply a specified set of rules to produce the table(s) in *Kim* (they are just updated by a user). Nor is it taught or suggested that the table(s) are based on the service option selection and the capacity information.

Second, as discussed above, "[T]he daemon, using the parameters from the modified fields of the centralized database, will update or synchronize the server configuration with the updated centralized database fields accordingly." (*Kim*, p.4, para. 0035) (emphasis added). Thus, the configuration parameters for a particular server is not determined in *Kim* but merely updated or synchronized.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, *Kim* does not teach or suggest at least "applying a specified set of rules to produce a result set based on the service option selection and the capacity information" and "determining configuration parameters for one or more network elements based on the result set," as recited by Claim 1. Thus, *Kim* does not anticipate independent Claim 1. Reconsideration and favorable action are respectfully requested.

Applicants submit that independent Claims 8, 15 and 21 are allowable for reasons analogous to those above in conjunction with Claim 1. Reconsideration and favorable action are respectfully requested.

Claims 2-7 depend from independent Claim 1, Claims 9-14 depend from independent Claim 8, and Claims 16-20 depend from independent Claim 15, and are also not anticipated by *Kim* because they include the limitations of their respective base claim, which are shown above to be allowable, as well as additional limitations that further distinguish *Kim*. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 2-7, 9-14 and 16-20 be withdrawn.

DAL01:811782.1

ATTORNEY'S DOCKET
2001P07466US

PATENT APPLICATION
USSN 09/675,312

10

In addition to depending from independent Claim 1, which is shown above to be allowable, Claim 2 is also allowable because it contains additional limitations not disclosed by *Kim*. For example, Claim 2 recites "receiving provisioning information based on the result set, and provisioning each of the network elements based on the provisioning information." As discussed above, *Kim* merely updates configuration parameters for a server. There is no receiving of provisioning information taught or suggested by *Kim*.

For at least this additional reason, *Kim* does not anticipate Claim 2. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claim 2.

In addition to depending from independent Claim 1, which is shown above to be allowable, Claim 6 is also allowable because it contains additional limitations not disclosed by *Kim*. For example, Claim 6 recites "wherein the step of determining configuration parameters comprises locating the network elements at a location remote from the integrated communication server and downloading the network elements from the remote location." *Kim* simply does not teach or suggest downloading network elements from a remote location to determine configuration parameters.

For at least this additional reason, *Kim* does not anticipate Claim 6. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claim 6.

DAL01:811782.1

ATTORNEY'S DOCKET
2001P07466US

PATENT APPLICATION
USSN 09/675,312

11

CONCLUSIONS

For the foregoing reasons and for apparent reasons, Applicants respectfully request allowance of all pending claims.

If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference or an interview would advance prosecution of this Application in any manner, the undersigned attorney for Applicants stands ready to conduct such a conference at the convenience of the Examiner.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-2179 of Siemens Information & Communications Products, L.L.C.

Date: Sept. 14, 2004

Respectfully requested,

SIEMENS CORPORATION
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, New Jersey 08830
ATTENTION: Elsa Keller, IP Department
Telephone: (732) 321-3026

By: Thomas George
Thomas George
Registration No. 45,740
Attorney for Applicants
Tel: 650-694-5191
Fax: 650-968-4517

DAL01:811782.1